

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. No claims have been amended. No claims have been added. No claims have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 13-15 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such as omissions amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submit that claims 1, 12, 25, and 29 were previously amended to include the limitation “wherein directing replication comprises sending a replica of the at least one application service object to the client device from the server” to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. However, claims 13-15 and 28 are directed to a server, a client device, a system, and a server, respectively, and constitute machines according to MPEP 2106. As such, claims 13-15 and 28 were not amended to include the limitation “wherein directing replication comprises sending a replica of the at least one application service object to the client device from the server.” Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation of *sending a replica to the client device from the server* is not an essential structural cooperative relationship of elements that amounts to a gap between the necessary structural connections because the structural relationship between the server and the one or more client devices is already defined. For example, the server of claim 13 includes a network interface for the use in communicating to one or more client devices and a replication manager to direct replication of at least one application service object from the server to the client device. As such, the structural cooperative relationship of elements is already defined. Accordingly, claims 13-15 and 28 are not incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationship of elements. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been

overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Applicant submits that claims 13-15 and 28 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 12-15, 25, 28, and 29 because of informalities that the claim limitations do not specifically recite any manipulation and/or transformation in the claim limitations that would produce a tangible result. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 12, 25, and 29 were previously amended to include the limitation “wherein directing replication comprises sending a replica of the at least one application service object to the client device from the server.” Sending a replicate of the at least one application service object to the client device from the server is not a mathematical or abstract idea, but rather constitutes a useful, concrete, and tangible result under MPEP 2106 because the result (e.g., sending a replica) has a real world practical application/use. As such, claims 1, 12, 25, and 29 produce a tangible result by sending a replica of the at least one application service object to the client device from the server as part of directing replication of at least one application service object. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1, 12-15, 25, 28, and 29 specifically recite a manipulation and/or a transformation in the claims that would produce a tangible result, and respectfully submits that the objection of claims 1, 12-15, 25, 28, and 29 for informalities be withdrawn. Applicants submit that Claims 1-29 as amended are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that claims 1-29 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections to the claims have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that Claims 1-29 as amended are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 11/20/07

By: 
Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300